

Detecting the Photon-Photon Interaction by Colliding Laser Beam Interferometry

M. Hossein Partovi[†]

Department of Physics and Astronomy, California State University

Sacramento, California 95819-6041

(February 1, 2008)

Abstract

The feasibility of detecting the photon-photon interaction using Fabry-Perot type laser interferometers developed for gravity wave detection is demonstrated. An “external” laser beam, serving as a refractive medium, is alternatively fed into the cavities of the interferometer and made to collide with the “internal” beams thereby inducing a measurable phase difference between them. [hep-ph/9308293]

PACS numbers: 12.20.Fv, 12.20.Ds, 14.80.Am, 07.60.Ly

In 1933, Delbrück [1] suggested that quantum effects would cause photons to be scattered by an external electric field thereby violating the linearity of Maxwell electrodynamics. Shortly thereafter, Halpern [2], unaware of Delbrück's suggestion, realized that the process of pair creation would in effect polarize the vacuum and give rise to a small photon-photon interaction. This interaction, he suggested, could in principle be observed in the scattering of light by light. Delbrück's phenomenon was first observed by R. Wilson [3] in 1953 in the scattering of 1.33 Mev gamma rays by the Coulomb field of the lead nucleus. Delbrück scattering is essentially the interaction of a real photon with a virtual one. The interaction of two virtual photons, on the other hand, is a common occurrence in present day high-energy collisions, and has been studied extensively in recent years [4].

By contrast, the interaction of two real photons has never been detected because of its extreme weakness. The center-of-mass photon-photon cross section is equal to $.031\alpha^2 r_e^2 (\omega/m)^6$ for $\omega/m \ll 1$ and nearly equal to it almost up to the pair production threshold $\omega = m$ [5]; here α is the fine-structure constant, r_e the classical electron radius, ω the photon energy, and m the electron mass (natural units will be used until otherwise stated). For 633 nm light, this cross section is about 4×10^{-64} cm², and it rises steeply to about 3×10^{-30} cm² near the production threshold. These minute cross sections are the reason why light-light scattering has not been much discussed in connection with nonlinear electrodynamic effects arising from vacuum polarization, attention having been focused instead on the magnetic counterpart of Delbrück scattering, namely the scattering of photons by an external magnetic field [6]. Nevertheless, as the following discussion will show, the combination of high intensity and frequency stability of laser light, coupled with the astonishing sensitivity of present-day Michelson interferometers, makes it possible to overcome these incredibly small cross sections and observe photon-photon interaction with real photons.

The purpose of this Letter is to demonstrate the feasibility of detecting photon-photon interaction using the technology of Fabry-Perot type laser interferometers developed for gravity wave detection [7]. The proposed method relies on the fact that a beam of light essentially acts as a weakly refractive medium for the propagation of another electromagnetic

wave. Therefore, if the output of an “external” laser is alternatively fed into one of the two Fabry-Perot cavities of the interferometer at frequency f and made to collide with the “internal” beams, it will induce an alternating relative phase difference of the same frequency between the latter, just as gravitational waves do in the case of gravity wave detectors. To get an idea of the magnitudes involved, it is convenient to carry this analogy further. For gravity waves, the quantity measured by the detector is the *gravitational-wave strain*, h , which is a measure of the deviation of space-time curvature from its background value caused by the gravitational wave. For photon interaction detection, the analogous quantity is the *refractivity*, r , of the external laser beam inside the resonator cavities, defined as usual to be the deviation of the refractive index from unity. The refractivity of a beam of electromagnetic waves, as shown by calculations presented below, is of the order of $\alpha^2 u/u_e$, where u is the energy density in the beam and $u_e = m^4 = 1.4 \times 10^{24} \text{ J/m}^3$ is essentially the *Compton energy density of the electron*. In comparing the two cases, it must be remembered that there are important differences between them favoring photon interaction detection. Among these, features that directly bear on the question of detection feasibility are (a) the fixed nature of cavity mirrors, essentially limiting noise to photon shot noise, (b) the fact that the signal frequency f is under total control, allowing longer photon detection times and other fine-tuning measures for sensitivity optimization, and (c) the enhancement of the external laser output (hence its refractivity) by a factor of $\sim B^2$ in the resonator cavities, where B is the mean number of reflections in the cavities.

In the following, we will use these considerations together with detailed estimates to show that sensitivity levels comparable to those already achieved by prototype gravity wave detectors are sufficient to detect photon-photon interaction by colliding laser beam interferometry (CLBI). Needless to say, the detection and measurement of the interaction of light with light would constitute an important milestone not only as a direct test of fundamental quantum electrodynamics but also as an ultrahigh-precision experiment.

The first step in the calculation is to find the interaction energy of an assembly of photons to leading order in α and ω/m . As is well known, the leading contribution to

photon-photon scattering is of second order in α and originates in the box diagram in which four external photon lines are attached to a closed electron loop [8]. In leading order, the matrix element for this diagram is directly related to the interaction energy in question (in much the same way as the Born amplitude for potential scattering is related to the matrix element of the interaction potential). Moreover, the ω/m ($\sim 10^{-5}$ for visible light) limit of this contribution can conveniently be cast in the form of an effective Lagrangian modifying the Maxwell Lagrangian for free photons, as was first shown by Euler and Heisenberg [9].

Using either the matrix element for the box diagram in the limit $\omega/m \rightarrow 0$ or the Euler-Heisenberg Lagrangian, one finds, after a lengthy but essentially straightforward calculation, the result [10]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} = & -\frac{\alpha^2}{45m^4} \sum_{\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{e}'} \int \int [\mathbf{d}\mathbf{k}] [\mathbf{d}\mathbf{k}'] n(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{e}) n(\mathbf{k}', \mathbf{e}') \\ & \times k k' \Pi(\hat{\mathbf{k}}, \mathbf{e}; \hat{\mathbf{k}}', \mathbf{e}') \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

for the desired interaction energy density. Here $n(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{e})$ is the number of photons of momentum $\mathbf{k}$ and (unit) polarization vector $\mathbf{e}$, $k = |\mathbf{k}|$, and $[\mathbf{d}\mathbf{k}]$ stands for $d^3k/(2\pi)^3$. Moreover, Π is a non-negative, dimensionless number of order unity equal to $4\mathcal{R}^2 + 7\mathcal{I}^2$, where $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{I}$ are the real and imaginary parts of the quantity $\mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{f}'$, and $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{e} + i\hat{\mathbf{k}} \times \mathbf{e}$. Note that $\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}}$ represents a sum of negative two-body interaction terms; *photons attract photons*. Furthermore, Π vanishes for $\hat{\mathbf{k}} = \hat{\mathbf{k}}'$ as a result of the vanishing of the center-of-mass energy of the pair; *parallel photons don't interact*.

For situations involving large numbers of photons, Eq. (1) can be reformulated to give the average first-order energy shift of a photon resulting from its interaction with the rest of the assembly. Defining $\omega_{\text{int}} = \delta\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}}/\delta n$, we find

$$\omega_{\text{int}}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{e})/\omega_0 = -\frac{2\alpha^2}{45m^4} \sum_{\mathbf{e}'} \int [\mathbf{d}\mathbf{k}'] \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{k}', \mathbf{e}') \Pi(\hat{\mathbf{k}}, \mathbf{e}; \hat{\mathbf{k}}', \mathbf{e}'), \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{e}) = kn(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{e})$ is the phase-space energy distribution function for the assembly, and $\omega_0 = k$ is the energy of a free photon. Note that the fractional energy shift $\omega_{\text{int}}/\omega_0$ of a photon is independent of its (free) energy k and only depends on the orientations of its

momentum and polarization. This implies that the speed of propagation of electromagnetic waves through an assembly of photons is reduced by a factor of $1 - \omega_{\text{int}}/\omega_0$ relative to free space, and that therefore the photon assembly act as an anisotropic, linear, refractive medium of refractivity $r = \omega_{\text{int}}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{e})/\omega_0$ [11]. Eq. (2) can thus be used to find the refractive index for any desired configuration of interacting electromagnetic waves.

The configurations of interest here are those involving *beams*, for which $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{k}', \mathbf{e}')$ would be concentrated along some fixed direction, say $\hat{\mathbf{k}}'_0$. The corresponding refractivity is then found to be

$$r(\hat{\mathbf{k}}, \mathbf{e}; \hat{\mathbf{k}}'_0) = \frac{2\alpha^2}{45}(u/u_e)(1 - \cos\theta)^2[4 + 3\langle\sin^2(\psi - \phi)\rangle]. \quad (3)$$

Here $u = \sum_{\mathbf{e}'} \int [\mathbf{d}\mathbf{k}'] \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{k}', \mathbf{e}')$ is the energy density of photons in the refracting medium, (θ, ϕ, ψ) are the three Euler angles that rotate the $(\mathbf{e}, \hat{\mathbf{k}} \times \mathbf{e}, \hat{\mathbf{k}})$ triad onto $(\mathbf{e}', \hat{\mathbf{k}}'_0 \times \mathbf{e}', \hat{\mathbf{k}}'_0)$, and angular brackets are used to denote the polarization average with respect to $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{k}', \mathbf{e}')$. Recall that $\hat{\mathbf{k}}'_0$ is now the (fixed) direction of the refracting beam. Note also that $\cos\theta = 1(-1)$ corresponds to parallel (antiparallel) beams, confirming the absence of interaction for parallel photons. For colliding (i.e., antiparallel) beams, Eq. (3) reduces to

$$r(\mathbf{e}) = \frac{8\alpha^2}{45}(u/u_e)[4 + 3\langle|\mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{e}'|^2\rangle]. \quad (4)$$

Note that the polarization average in (4) is zero for parallel-polarized beams, reaches a maximum of unity for cross-polarized beams, and reduces to a half if either beam is unpolarized.

It is also worth noting here that if the photons of the refracting medium are unpolarized (but otherwise of arbitrary configuration), Eq. (2) reduces to

$$r(\hat{\mathbf{k}}) = \frac{11\alpha^2}{45m^4} \int [\mathbf{d}\mathbf{k}'] (1 - \hat{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{k}}')^2 \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{k}'), \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{k}')$ is the polarization-summed energy distribution function of the refracting medium. One can verify that Eq. (5) agrees with Eq. (4) for the case of antiparallel beams at least one of which is unpolarized.

We are now in a position to derive detection limit estimates for CLBI. As mentioned at the outset, the configuration considered here is that of the basic Fabry-Perot type interferometer

used for gravity wave detection [7] suitably modified to accept the output of an external laser into its cavities [12]. Inside each cavity, the external laser beam acts as a refractive medium, colliding with the internal beam and inducing in it a phase change proportional to the refractivity of the external beam. The two lasers must be operated at (or very near, depending on the detailed mode in which the interferometer is operated) the resonance frequencies of the cavities, and the two frequencies must be sufficiently different to allow an efficient filtering of the external beam photons so that only internal beam photons find their way to the photodetector. Furthermore, the input of the external laser into the cavities can be modulated so as to alternate between the two with a frequency f , say according to the modulation factors $[1 \pm \cos(2\pi ft)]/2$.

Let the power output of the internal and external lasers be P_{int} and P_{ext} , respectively. The output of the lasers will be assumed to be unpolarized, so that the refractivity of the external beam as given by Eq. (4) or (5) is equal to $\frac{44}{45}(u/u_e)$. Therefore the amplitude of the difference in the refractivities of the external beams inside the two cavities, denoted by Δr_{ext} , is, up to factors of order unity, given by $\alpha^2 B^2 P_{\text{ext}}/cu_e A$, where A is the average cross section of the external beam inside the cavities and c is the speed of light in vacuum (SI units will be used hereafter). Recall that B is the mean number of reflections inside the cavities ($\sim$ cavity finesse). Thus with L representing the length of each cavity, the amplitude of the relative phase between the two internal beams arising from the difference in the refractivities is given by the usual formula $BL\Delta r_{\text{ext}}/\lambda$, where λ is the reduced wavelength of the internal laser light.

A customary and useful way of characterizing the detection limit of the interferometer, assumed to be governed by the photon shot noise, would be to define a *shot-noise equivalent* refractivity

$$r_{\text{shot}} \approx \left[\frac{\hbar c \lambda f}{P_{\text{int}} (BL)^2} \right]^{1/2}, \quad (6)$$

which (up to factors of order unity) is the amplitude of the refractivity difference that would produce the same signal at the photodetector as the shot noise [7,13]. It should be noted

here that Eq. (6) assumes that (a) the photodetector integration time τ is matched to the modulation frequency f for optimal sensitivity, $\tau = (2f)^{-1}$, and (b) τ is not less than the mean life time of an internal beam photon in the cavities, $\tau \geq BL/c$.

Using Eq. (6) and the expression for r_{ext} , we arrive at an estimate of the signal-to-noise ratio for CLBI:

$$\Delta r_{\text{ext}} \div r_{\text{shot}} \approx \frac{\alpha^2 B^2 P_{\text{ext}}}{cu_e A} \div \left[\frac{\hbar c \lambda f}{P_{\text{int}} (BL)^2} \right]^{1/2}. \quad (7)$$

A more convenient form of Eq. (7) for numerical estimates is

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta r_{\text{ext}}/r_{\text{shot}} \approx & 25 \frac{L}{10\text{m}} \frac{10^{-5}\text{m}^2}{A} \frac{P_{\text{ext}}}{50\text{W}} \left(\frac{B}{10^4} \right)^3 \\ & \times \left(\frac{P_{\text{int}}}{50\text{W}} \frac{10^{-3}\text{Hz}}{f} \frac{10^{-7}\text{m}}{\lambda} \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

This formula can be used to estimate the expected detection limit of a colliding laser beam interferometer. The individual magnitudes of Δr_{ext} and r_{shot} for the numerical values used in Eq. (8) are 6.3×10^{-23} and 2.5×10^{-24} , respectively. Note that the fiducial numerical values used in Eq. (8) are consistent with the present-day technology of gravity wave detectors. Indeed some of these values (e.g., f or L) can be extended in the direction of boosting the ratio in Eq. (8) without much difficulty.

The estimate given in Eq. (8) and the arguments leading to it provide the evidence for the feasibility of detecting the interaction of light with light by means of CLBI. Compared to gravity wave detection, CLBI enjoys three important advantages mentioned before, namely the absence of moving parts, the total controllability of the signal frequency, and the possibility of signal amplification by means of external laser intensity build-up inside the cavities (cf. the B^2 dependence in Δr_{ext}). On the other hand, CLBI requires the design and development of the extra optics required for piping, aligning, focusing, and filtering the colliding laser beams. Incidentally, a numerically accurate version of the estimates given above can only be given when details of the optics such as the transverse profiles of the colliding beams inside the resonators are specified.

We conclude by recalling that our aim in the above discussion has been to establish the essential feasibility of detecting the photon-photon interaction with colliding laser beams by means of a detailed analysis of a specific experimental arrangement. This arrangement is really a minimal and generic modification of Fabry-Perot type interferometers developed for gravity wave detection and may not be the most suitable design for carrying out the actual experiment [14]. Nevertheless, it does serve to establish that the phenomenon in question is within present experimental reach.

This work was supported in part by a research award from the California State University, Sacramento.

REFERENCES

[†] E-mail address: *hpartovi@csus.edu*

- [1] M. Delbrück, Z. Physik **84**, 144 (1933).
- [2] O. Halpern, Phys. Rev. **44**, 855 (1933).
- [3] R. Wilson, Phys. Rev. **90**, 720 (1953).
- [4] Ch. Berger and W. Wagner, Phys. Rep. **146**, 1 (1987).
- [5] R. Karplus and M. Neumann, Phys. Rev. **83**, 776 (1951).
- [6] S. Adler, J. Bahcall, C. Callan, and M. Rosenbluth, Phys. Rev. Lett. **25**, 1061 (1970);
E. Iacopini and E. Zavattini, Phys. Lett. B**85**, 151 (1979).
- [7] K. Thorne, in *300 Years of Gravitation*, edited by S. Hawking and W. Israel (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1987), p. 330; A. Abramovici *et al.*, Science **256**, 325 (1992), and references therein.
- [8] A. Akhiezer and V. Berestetskii, *Quantum Electrodynamics* (Interscience Publishers, New York, 1965), p. 768.
- [9] W. Heisenberg and H. Euler, Z. Physik **98**, 714 (1936).
- [10] H. Partovi, “QED Corrections to Planck’s Radiation Law and Photon Thermodynamics,” submitted for publication (1993).
- [11] That photon-photon interactions give rise to anisotropic refractivity and other exotic effects has been known for a long time; see Ref. [6].
- [12] Of course there is no need in CLBI for *suspended* mirrors which are essential, and potential sources of extra noise, for gravity wave detectors.
- [13] In general B depends on wavelength and need not be the same for the two light sources used in the interferometer. However, we are only interested in estimates here and will

therefore overlook the difference.

- [14] For example, we have not exploited the polarization dependence of the interaction at all. As made clear by remarks following Eq. (4), the refractivity of a beam has a strong polarization dependence which can be used to advantage in the optical processing of the beams.